



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/507,103	09/10/2004	Yoel Sasson	SASSON3	2096
1444	7590	07/27/2009		
BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.			EXAMINER	
624 NINTH STREET, NW			PURDY, KYLE A	
SUITE 300				
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-5303			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1611	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/27/2009	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/507,103	SASSON ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Kyle Purdy	1611	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 May 2009.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,3-13,15-17,20-22,24, 25 and 28 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1 and 3-13 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 15-17,20-22,24,25 and 28 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .                                    |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4 pages (05/14/2009 and 06/26/2009)</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |



**DETAILED ACTION**

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 05/14/2009 has been entered.

***Status of Application***

2. The Examiner acknowledges receipt of the amendments filed on 05/14/2009 wherein claims 15 and 22 have been amended and claims 19 and 23 have been cancelled.

3. Claims 15-17, 20-22, 24, 25 and 28 are presented for examination on the merits. The following rejections are made.

***Response to Applicants' Arguments***

4. Applicants arguments filed 05/14/2009 regarding the rejection of claims 15, 16, 20, 22 and 28 made by the Examiner under 35 USC 103(a) over Taranta et al. (US 2002/0098221) have been fully considered and they are found persuasive. This rejection has been overcome by amendment to the claims

5. Applicants arguments filed 05/14/2009 regarding the rejection of claims 17, 21 and 23-25 made by the Examiner under 35 USC 103(a) Taranta in view of Lubetzky et al. (EP 0670113) have been fully considered and they are found persuasive. This rejection has been overcome by amendment to the claims.

6. Applicants arguments filed 05/14/2009 regarding the rejection of claim 19 made by the Examiner under 35 USC 103(a) over Taranta in view of Aven (US 6165940) have been fully

considered and they are found persuasive. This rejection has been overcome by amendment to the claims.

7. However, because the Examiner is reapplying Taranta, Lubetzky and Aven in the new grounds of rejections, Applicants assertion regarding said references will be addressed:

**A)** The solvents mentioned by Taranta constitute a huge “basket” disclosure which does not put the person of ordinary skill in the art in possession of any particular solvent. The only real guidance is found in the examples of Taranta where no lactate ester is used; and

**B)** Aven is directed to a non-aqueous suspension concentrate (SC) formulation, not a liquid emulsion (EW) composition. Thus there would be no reason to combine Taranta with Aven.

8. In response to A, this argument is not persuasive. The selection of a lactate ester would have been obvious. The abstract and the claims of Taranta specifically teach that the composition is to comprise an ester of aliphatic monocarboxylic acids. Exemplified esters include those of lactic acid such as ethyl and butyl lactate. The disclosure of potential monocarboxylic esters is not a “basket” disclosure. In fact, the number of disclosed monocarboxylic esters is quite limited and it would have been obvious to try any one of those disclosed with a reasonable expectation for success. It is obvious to try choosing from a finite number of identified, predictable solvents, with a reasonable expectation of success. With respect to the argument that the only real guidance in formulating the solution is that of the Examples. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. MPEP 2123 states that patents are relevant as prior art for all they contain. Thus, while the examples of Taranta do not teach a composition with a lactate ester, any person would have been readily capable of reading the specification, identifying lactate esters as useful solvents and including said lactate ester to arrive at a

composition with the presently claimed properties. Applicants arguments are not found persuasive.

9. With respect to assertion B, this argument is not persuasive. The teaching of Aven is not being used for its SC disclosure. Instead, Aven is being applied to illustrate that the presently claimed pesticides are known in the art and any person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include those into the composition of Taranta with a reasonable expectation for success in arriving at a composition capable of controlling insect populations. With respect to the composition being in the form of an SC, this does not mitigate the rejection. As Applicants have pointed out, the SC formulation is to be formulated into aqueous dispersion and emulsion prior to application to crops. Thus, the SC is ultimately diluted to an EW, which is not different from the form of compositions taught by Taranta. Applicants arguments are not found persuasive.

**New Rejections, Necessitated by Amendment**  
***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

Art Unit: 1611

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

**12. Claims 15, 16, 20, 22 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taranta et al. (US 2002/0098221; of record) in view of Aven (US 6165940; of record).**

13. Taranta is directed to oil-in-water (EW) formulations of insecticides for agricultural purposes. The composition is taught to also comprise one or more solvents including carboxylic acids with functional groups such as lactic acid (see [0032]; see instant claim 15). Exemplified compounds are ethylhexyl lactate, butyl lactate, ethyl lactate and so on (see [0032]; see instant claim 16). The formulation is to comprise from between 1 to 25% by weight of a cosolvent such that crystallization of the product is inhibited (see [0045]; see instant claim 20). Taranta teaches also teaches that the pesticide is to be included in the composition from 0.05 g/L to 200 g/L (0.005% to 20% by weight).

14. Taranta fails to specifically teach a composition that comprises a lactate ester. Taranta fails to teach the composition as having a weight ratio between the pesticide and the lactate ester as being from 1:1 to 1:4. Taranta also fails to teach the EW as comprising any of the instantly claimed pesticides

15. Aven is directed to non-aqueous suspension concentrates for agricultural purposes. It is taught that the concentrate can be formulated into aqueous dispersions and emulsions (column 8, lines 21-25). Exemplified pesticides for crop protection include flusilazole, prochloraz and penconazole (see column 3, lines 5-25).

16. Regardless, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the teachings of Taranta with a reasonable expectation for success in arriving at a pesticidal composition comprising a lactate ester wherein the pesticide is perchloraz, flusilazole or penconazole. As taught by Taranta, lactate esters are useful because they prevent premature crystallization of the pesticidal EWs. With respect to the requirement that the weight ratio of the pesticide to lactate ester this limitation is obvious. One ordinarily skilled in the art would be motivated to adjust the ratio of the compounds knowing that one is needed to kill the desired pest and that the other is needed to prevent premature crystallization of the composition. If by standard optimization of the composition one found that a ratio of 1:1 to 1:4 was useful and significant, then this result would be one of ordinary skill and common sense, and not one of innovation. With respect, one would have been motivated to include such pesticides because they are known to be useful for protecting agricultural crops from insect damage. Therefore, a pesticidal EW comprising a lactate ester wherein the pesticide and the lactate ester have a weight ratio of 1:1 to 1:4 to is *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the references, especially in absence of evidence to the contrary.

**17. Claims 17, 21 and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taranta et al. (US 2002/0098221; of record) in view of Lubetzky et al. (EP 0670113; of record) as applied to claims 15, 16, 20, 22 and 28 above, and further in view of Lubetzky et al. (US 0670113).**

18. Taranta and Aven are relied upon for disclosure described in the rejection of claims 15, 16, 20, 22 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

19. Taranta fails to teach the EW compositions as comprising a rosin component.

20. Lubetzky cures this deficiency. Lubetzky is directed to agrochemical EWs. The EW comprises a pesticide and a rosin/rosin derivative (see abstract). Exemplified rosin derivatives include rosin esters (see page 4; see instant claim 17). It is taught that inclusion of rosin and rosin derivatives are beneficial because they impart stability to the composition as well as reduce phytotoxicity (see page 4). The plasticizer is to be included into the composition at a weight percent of from about 0.5% to about 50% (see page 2; see instant claims 21 and 24). Pesticides are to be included into the composition from about 4.5% to about 67% by weight (see page 2).

21. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Taranta with Lubetzky with a reasonable expectation for success in arriving at an EW comprising a rosin derivative from 1 to 15% by weight of the composition. One would have been motivated to include rosin derivatives into the EW of Taranta because in doing so would result in a product with enhanced stability and reduced phytotoxicity. With respect to the requirement that the weight ratio between the pesticide and the rosin be from 1:0.05 to 1:1, this requirement is obvious. As the compositions are directed to pesticidal EWs, and rosin derivatives are being included to impart stability and reduce phytotoxicity, one ordinarily skilled in the art would endeavor to optimize a composition such that the effects of both were strongly utilized. If such a result were that the weight ratio between the pesticide and the rosin was 1:0.05 to 1:1, then this result would be one of ordinary skill and common sense. Therefore, a pesticidal EW comprising a rosin derivative wherein the pesticide

Art Unit: 1611

and the rosin have a weight ratio of 1:.05 to 1:1 to is *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the references, especially in absence of evidence to the contrary.

### ***Conclusion***

22. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyle A. Purdy whose telephone number is 571-270-3504. The examiner can normally be reached from 9AM to 5PM.

23. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sharmila Landau, can be reached on 571-272-0614. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

24. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*/Kyle Purdy/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1611  
July 22, 2009*

*/David J Blanchard/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1643*